

**REMARKS**

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed on August 8, 2008, claims 1 to 21 are amended and the Applicant would like to respectfully requests that the patent application be reconsidered and allowed.

An item-by-item response to Examiner's objections or rejections is provided in the followings:

**1. *Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 101:***

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6, and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response to the rejections, claims 1-6 and 13-18 are amended as document review system implemented in a computer. The system as now amended further includes document processing module, display processing module implemented in a computer that be implemented either as hardware, firmware or software modules. Such systems as now amended would therefore satisfy the utility requirement and also are within the scopes of the statutory subject matters. The applicant would like to respectfully requests that the 35 USC 101 Rejection be withdrawn for the claims 1-6, and 13-18 as now amended.

**1. *Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103:***

The Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al., US 5,991,780 A priority filed 11/19/1993 in view of Krause et al., US 5,625,827 filed 12/23/1994.

According to the Examiner, Rivette et al. teaches all the claim elements with the exceptions that were further disclosed by Krause that teaches with additional disclosures. According to Examiner's instructions, Krause teaches the following inventive features relevant to the claims of this invention.

- 1) Texture descriptions included in a ***secondary document*** that describes said NAMING TERM, such as describing the NAMING TERM which is designated by said alpha numeral designation "A" (Krause Figure 5, element 65).
- 2) Furthermore, it would have been obvious to do so providing the benefit of allowing the user to obtain additional information with regard to the naming term that ***may not be conveniently display on the initial display screen.***
- 3) Krause teaches each NAMING TERM displayed immediately and directly next to the graphic elements in Figs. 3-5 and col. 5 lines 7-18, specifically ***Krause Fig. 5, showing a NAMING TERM SUCH AS "BUILDING PAPER".***

For convenience of reference and comparison, two paragraphs of Krause's disclosures included in column 5, lines 7-18 as cited by the Examiner are also copied below for a more careful and detail review.

The indicating means 48 includes labeling means 50 which places a name and label at the hotspot 55 which identifies the secondary document by file name. It is to be further understood that a secondary or detail document may act as the primary document so that it may include a hotspot 55 which references a different secondary document for call-up.

The indicating means 48 also includes linking means 52 for displaying the secondary document when the hotspot 55 is activated. Activation of a hotspot 55 occurs by clicking or actuating the hotspot 55 by the mouse/cursor 20, or using the keyboard 16 with cursor/enter. The linking means 52 accesses the name of the secondary document in the hotspot 55 to call up the secondary document. The secondary file is identified by the name in the hotspot 55, and the processor means 13 automatically displays the secondary document upon activation of the hotspot 55. It is to be understood that the secondary document may be comprised of either graphic drawings or text, or may cause other external devices to be activated. The secondary document identified by the hotspot 55 is placed on top of the primary, calling document on the display screen 14, as subsequently discussed. (Column 5, Lines 7 to 28 of Krause Patent).

The Applicant would like to respectfully disagree with the Examiner according to above three instructions as provided by the Examiner.

- 1) The claims of this invention are directed to a SINGLE DOCUMENT and Krause disclose a system to correlate among many documents and files by NAMING FILE NAMES and DOCUMENT NAMES. Krause actually teaches away from the invention as directed by the claims now amended.
- 2) After careful reviews of Figs. 3-5 and careful reading of Krause disclosures including the above sections cited by the Examiner, the figures DO NOT show any NAMING TERMS at all. According to the Description of Krause on Column 9 lines 32 to 44 as copied in the followings:

"As an example of the system, an elevational view is illustrated in FIGS. 4-5 as displayed on the display 14 with the function bar there-along. This may be considered the primary document which includes a north elevation view. Located on these drawings are **four hotspots: A, B, C**, and numbered hotspots. The "**A**" hotspot will call up a textual description which is in a note or text file named A in memory 30 as illustrated in FIG. 5. Subsequent activation of the hotspot "B" will call up the B file and display same in a cascade fashion on the computer screen as in FIG. 5. The B file may be a sectional view as is illustrated. Thereafter, each of these documents may be exited in order to return and display the full primary document as in FIG. 4. (Column 9, lines 32-44),

"A", "B" and "C" are alpha numeral designations for a naming term "hot spot", but "hot spot" have never been displayed with any of the alpha-numeral designations. Therefore, Krause does not teach a display of "Naming Terms" directly and immediately next to the graphic element as directed by the invention now amended.
- 3) Alpha number designation 65 is described as "Window". Accordingly ""Window" is a naming term for the designation "65" in Krause. But all the drawings of Kraus have not shown "WINDOW" directly and immediately next to the graphic element pointed by the alpha numeral designation "65".

- 4) The Applicant would like to respectfully disagree with the Examiner and point out that "Building Paper" is NOT a NAMING TERM. The term building paper has never assigned with any alpha numeral designation and the term "BUILDING PAPER" has never been described in the text of Krause's Specification.
- 5) A careful review of Figs. 3-5 (and all other figures of Krause) and all figures of Rivette, there have no naming terms directly and immediately displayed next to the graphic element.

In response to the rejections, in order to more specifically clarify and limit the scopes of the inventions, claims 1-21 are further amended. For example claim 13 is amended to direct to:

A naming-term based and graphically aided document review and management system implemented in a computer for reading a single document having textual descriptions and at least a drawing consisted of graphic elements designated with graphic element designations associated with a naming term included and described in said textual description in said single document incorporated in a single processor-recognizable file, comprising:

a display processing module for displaying said drawing with said **naming term as described in said at least one associated segment of said textual description wherein said name term is** displayed immediately and directly next to said textual description of said single document incorporated in said single processor-recognizable file whereby a document reviewer can directly and simultaneously view and associate said naming term as described in said textual description to said graphic element without requiring a processor to process multiple files.

The claims 1 to 21 as now amended are clearly out of the scopes and not obvious over Rivette and Krause. Furthermore, the Applicant would respectfully direct Examiner's attention to the differences between this invention and Krause to further emphasize that Krause teaches away from the invention according to the claims as now amended.

The Applicant would like to respectfully submit that the disclosures made by Kraus actually and practically teach away from combining the multiple files into a single file as suggested by the Examiner. Krause teaches a system to store the construction drawings or blueprints in a plurality of computer files. Krause's inventions includes a method for manipulating a plurality of document files including construction building drawings in a computer memory to select "at least two measuring points in the drawing; and automatically determining a measured quantity represented by the measuring points scaled to the full scale dimension (**Krause column 2, lines 16-19**). For a system to store and manipulate construction drawings and blueprints, it would not be desirable or practical to combine these multiple files into a single file. Different subcontractors may handle different parts of the construction project. Each subcontractor would prefer to access a separate file without the requirement to invoke a single huge file that contains large amount of drawings and descriptions not necessarily related to the part managed and handled by different subcontractors. It is further undesirable to allow different subcontractor teams to access the design and detail blueprints unrelated to the construction jobs by combining the plurality of files into a single file.

For these reasons, the Applicant would like to respectfully disagree with the Examiner's application of Kraus in view of Rivette as a basis for obviousness for combining multiple blueprints and construction drawings into a single file. The disclosures as made by Krause when combined with Rivette actually teach away from this invention in processing a single file or a single document as already amended.

With the added elements, the amended claims have more limited scopes and further distinguish from Rivette and Krause with distinguishing advantages of easier to review/process with simplified processes incorporated in a software system that neither Rivette nor Krause has ever suggested or motivated. Specifically, the amended claims are further differentiated from Krause:

- 1) The "alpha-numeral designation" in Krause, i.e., the "hot spots A, B, C", are used by Krause and named as "Hot Spot" only to link to different files or "note", but these naming terms, i.e., "Hot Spot" have never been displayed directly and immediately next to the graphic elements in the

drawings. The claims as now amended for this invention further specifically limited to the naming terms that are described in the textual descriptions and shown immediately and directly next to the graphic element named by the naming term.

- 2) The display of Krause of these hot spots A, B, C are shown in a different "Windows" and not "immediately and directly next to the graphic element. The display shown in Fig. 5 with different display "windows" are actually away and NOT directly related to the graphic elements but a different level of the "hot spots". The claims as now amended are different, not obvious when compared with the display shown in Fig. 5 of Kraus that actually teaches away from the invention as now amended with more specific, limited and narrower scopes.

For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn for the amended claims.

For the above reasons, the claims 1-21 would be non-obvious in view of the cited prior art references.

With the claims as now presented and the reasons provided above, the applicant hereby respectfully requests that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 103 be withdrawn and the present application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bo-In Lin.

By



Bo-In Lin -- Attorney, Registration No. 33,948  
13445 Mandoli Drive, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022  
(650) 949-0418 (Tel), (650) 949-4118 (Fax)